

### **Remarks**

Reconsideration and reexamination of the above-identified patent application, as amended, are respectfully requested. Claims 1-10 and 12-17 are pending in this application upon entry of this Amendment. In this Amendment, the Applicant has amended claims 1 and 3; and added claims 12-17. No claims have been cancelled in this Amendment. Of the pending claims, claims 1 and 3 are the only independent claims.

The Applicant has written claim 3 in independent form to include the limitations of amended independent claim 1 as presented herein and the limitations of claims 2-3 as previously presented. New claims 12-17 depend from amended independent claim 3. New claims 12-17 correspond to claims 5-10 which depend from amended independent claim 1.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office Action mailed May 28, 2004, the Examiner rejected claim 1, 5, 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,169,497 issued to Robert ("Robert"). The Applicant believes that the claimed invention is patentable over Robert and has amended independent claim 1 to more clearly define thereover.

#### **1. The Claimed Invention**

The claimed invention, as recited in amended independent claim 1, is a remote communication system for use with a vehicle. The system generally includes first and second communications units. The first communication unit is located within a vehicle. The second communication unit is portable.

The first communication unit has a transceiver connectable with a long-distance wireless communication network, such as a cellular network. The second communication unit

has a transceiver connectable with a unit for long-distance wireless communication, such as a cellular terminal.

The communication units connect with each other using the long-distance wireless communication network, thereby establishing a remote two-way communication link between the communication units. The two-way communication link extends from the first communication unit to the long-distance wireless communication network to the unit for long-distance wireless communication to the second communication unit such that information is transferrable from the first communication unit to the second communication unit via the two-way communication link and such that information is transferrable from the second communication unit to the first communication unit via the two-way communication link.

## **2. Robert**

Robert discloses a passive remote tracking system 10 for a vehicle 16. As set forth in the Background Art section of the Applicant's specification, such remote tracking systems which are passive only provide information regarding the position of the vehicle. Robert discloses a portable remote control 20 which is employed to have the vehicle 16 initiate the tracking process by transmitting an initiation signal 30 to tracking stations 12. (See FIG. 1; col. 4, lines 12-28; and col. 7, line 62 through col. 8, line 22.) Tracking stations 12 are in communication with satellites to receive position information from satellites 23. Based on this position information received from satellites 23, tracking stations 12 communicate with vehicle 16 to advise the vehicle of its position.

## **3. The Claimed Invention Compared to Robert**

The claimed invention generally differs from Robert in that in the claimed invention the first and second communication units are connected with each other via a remote-two way communication link extending from the first communication unit to a long-distance wireless communication network (such as a cellular network) to a unit for long-distance

wireless communication (such as a cellular terminal) to the second communication unit such that information is transferrable from the first communication unit to the second communication unit via the remote two-way communication link and such that information is transferrable from the second communication unit to the first communication unit via the remote two-way communication link.

Robert does not teach or suggest such a remote two-way communication link which extends from vehicle 16 (i.e., the first communication unit) to either of remote control 20 or tracking stations 12 (i.e., the second communication unit). In contrast, Robert teaches that vehicle 16 communicates directly with tracking stations 12 in order to receive position information obtained by the tracking stations from satellite 23. Remote control 20 is simply used to have vehicle 16 initiate communication with tracking stations 12. As such, in contrast to the claimed invention, there is no remote two-way communication link extending between vehicle 16 and remote control 20 or tracking stations 12 which extends through satellite 23 (i.e., through cellular network and cellular terminal).

Accordingly, the Applicant believes that amended independent claims 1 and 3 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Robert. Claims 5 and 7-10 depend from amended independent claim 1 and include the limitations therein. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 2-3 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,864,297 issued to Sollestre et al. The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,631,271 issued to Logan. The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Robert.

As indicated above, claim 3 as amended in independent form is believed to be patentable over Robert. Claims 2, 4, 6, and 11 depend from amended independent claim 1 and include the limitations therein. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

### **CONCLUSION**

In summary, claims 1-10, as amended, and newly added claims 12-17 meet the substantive requirements for patentability. The case is in appropriate condition for allowance. Accordingly, such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone or video conference would expedite allowance or resolve any further questions, such a conference is invited at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

**MARKUS VALTER WITTE**

By

James N. Kallis  
Reg. No. 41,102  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: June 29, 2004

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351